

# Town of Union

## PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

### Minutes of September 25, 2008

The Town of Union Plan Commission meeting was called to order on Thursday, September 25, 2008 at the Eager Free Public Library, 39 W. Main St., Evansville, WI at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Alvin Francis. Members present included Alvin Francis, Doug Zweizig, Kim Gruebling, Eric Larsen, Dave Pestor, Renee Exum, and Doug Lee. Also in attendance: Town Engineer Greg Hofmeister, Town Attorney Matt Dregne, and Clerk Regina Yvisaker. Town Board Chairman Kendall Schneider, and Supervisors George Franklin and Don Krajeck were also in attendance.

#### **Approve August 28, 2008 Plan Commission Minutes**

Motion to approve August 28, 2008 Plan Commission meeting minutes made by Kim Gruebling. Second by Eric Larsen. Renee Exum noted a correction on page 1 of the minutes: "lag land" should be corrected to read "ag land." Motion to approve minutes as amended carried by unanimous voice vote.

#### **Public Hearing: Review and recommendation of action on request made by Sigmond Vilagi, 15830 W. Union Rd., Brooklyn, WI for a land division and zoning change to separate off 35 acres of the existing 54 acre parcel located in the W1/4, NE ¼ of Section 9, parcel #6-20-28. The current parcel is zoned A-1; the resulting 35 acre parcel would retain A-1 zoning, and the parent parcel would be rezoned A-2.**

Steve Lathrop from Combs and Associates was in attendance, representing Sig Vilagi. He explained that the request is proposing that Vilagi retains an 18 acre parcel where house is located, and split off an approximately 35 acre parcel which would be sold to the person who currently farms it. The DOT acknowledges a current Ag driveway onto Highway 14 at the north end of property. The 18 acre parcel would be zoned A2, and the 35 acre parcel would retain A1 zoning.

Alvin Francis inquired exactly where the Ag entrance off Highway 14 was located; Lathrop explained it was approximately at the location of "124" mark at the north end of Lot 1 on the sketch map. Doug Lee asked if written confirmation from the DOT that the driveway location is approved has been obtained. It has not, as this is a new request and the other was withdrawn, however they do have acknowledgement of an Ag entrance at that location. Lee stated that the location of the Ag driveway seems to be a wooded lot, where is the driveway? Kevin Klahn, who currently farms the land, stated that the entrance is directly across from Jerry Marshall's old farm. He has been using it to move crops in and out and has approval to do so from the DOT. Lee would like to see the written approval from DOT, and would also like to see a deed restriction if they intend to continue to use it as Ag land.

Matt Dregne asked Lathrop if they intend to record a CSM; Lathrop stated they intend to record a two lot CSM, although they only have a sketch map at this time.

Francis asked Klahn how long he had been using the drive off Highway 14; Klahn stated he has been using it for 5 years, to avoid driving through the hay field located on the remainder of the property.

Exum stated that it was her understanding that the motion that was made at the last meeting requesting the information from the DOT was withdrawn; Kim Gruebling stated that the applicants should have been aware that the information was desired by the Plan Commission, given the discussion at the last meeting. Vilagi stated he would be willing to grant an easement to give access to the 35 acre lot off Union Road. That is what the DOT would prefer. Lee noted that an accident occurred within two miles of the location of the Ag drive last week, and access off Highway 14 is a major concern.

Public hearing closed at 7:11 p.m.

Doug Zweizig felt that it would have been helpful if driveway locations were noted on the maps, as it is a concern. Lathrop showed the Plan Commission the location on the map where an easement would be located. It would be along the east property line of the 18 acre lot, off of Union Road. Francis inquired as to what type of access it would be; Lathrop explained that easements are generally 50 feet wide. The easement would be placed in the deed to the 35 acre parcel.

Lee wondered if the proposed lots are similar in size and shape to lots that have been reviewed and approved in the past. Francis stated that the Plan Commission had not acted on very many Ag land divisions. Lee's opinion was that

he would still like to see the home divided off with a small amount of acreage and the rest remain a larger Ag land parcel. Larsen stated that approach would be more consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that there would be repercussions in the Town if this type of land division is acted upon. Francis does not see a problem with the division as proposed. Gruebling stated that past practice has been 3-5 acres of land divided off with the existing buildings, leaving a large Ag parcel; the Plan Commission has at times even argued why as much as 5 acres is needed with the buildings. Larsen stated that the request is not consistent with the Smart Growth Plan and approving it would set a precedent and allow other buildable lots on 35 acre lots, which would ultimately result in urban sprawl. Dave Pestor felt that the language in the zoning ordinance must be followed.

Would the applicant be willing to deed restrict the 35 acres? Vilagi is willing, Klahn agreed to as well.

Francis clarified that there would be no access to the lot from Highway 14, outside of the existing Ag driveway. All other access would be from the easement from the parent parcel.

Gruebling wondered if the deed restriction should be forever, or for a period of time like 99 years. Dregne stated that it is important to structure deed restrictions so they don't last forever, as there are circumstances under which the restriction would be terminated, such as if the Town and property owner agree that it should be removed or if Town boundaries change and the parcel is no longer located in the Town of Union. Those are the only two circumstances under which the deed restriction would be removed. A certain period of time could be included in the deed restriction. Larsen felt that the approach of having a way out of the deed restriction as proposed by Dregne is a good idea, it's important to have an out if and when it makes sense to do something different. Dregne felt that the key decision for this application is the zoning decision, not the CSM. Therefore, if the Plan Commission decides they want to go in the direction of approving the application, they should recommend that the change in zoning be approved conditioned upon the recording of deed restriction. Easement needs to be part of the CSM approval. Dregne can assist with creating the deed restriction and ordinance.

Motion to recommend to the Town Board approval of the request made by Sigmond Vilagi, 15830 W. Union Rd., Brooklyn, WI for a land division and zoning change to separate off 35 acres of the existing 54 acre parcel located in the W1/4, NE ¼ of Section 9, parcel #6-20-28; the current parcel is zoned A-1; the resulting 35 acre parcel would retain A-1 zoning, and the parent parcel would be rezoned A-2, provided that there is a driveway easement granted along the east edge of the parent parcel and that a deed restriction be placed upon the A1 parcel stating that there would be no residential development upon the property. The easement will be for ingress and egress onto lot one, and the deed restriction will be in a form approved by the Town Attorney and will be similar to the one prepared for the Dillman/Elmer property by Attorney Dregne. Motion made by Doug Zweizig. Second by Eric Larsen.

Larsen stated that it seemed that a policy was being set with this motion, perhaps addressing some of Francis' concerns about farmers selling land to one another. This issue should perhaps be addressed in the Smart Growth Plan review.

Roll call vote: Alvin Francis – Yes; Doug Zweizig – Yes; Kim Gruebling – Yes; Dave Pestor – Yes; Doug Lee – Yes; Eric Larsen – Yes; Renee Exum - Yes. Motion carried 7-0.

**Public Hearing: Review and recommendation of action on request made by Jerry & Teresa Marshall, 15933 W. Holt Rd., Brooklyn, WI for a land division and zoning change to separate off 2 acres from the existing 120 acre parcel located in the NE ¼, SE ¼ of section 4, parcel #6-20-29.1. The current parcel is zoned A-1; the resulting 2 acre parcel would be zoned RR, and the parent parcel would retain A-1 zoning. The purpose of the request is to allow their son to build a house.**

Public hearing opened at 7:36 p.m.

Jerry Marshall was in attendance, and explained that he just wants to allow his son to build a house on 2 acres. Francis asked Marshall if his son was involved with their farm business; Marshall stated he is not.

Regarding the scoring sheets, Lee stated that he found it hard to give honest answers on some issues, such as mineral rights and septic perk tests. Other members agreed, and it was clarified that if members are unable to answer the question it should be left blank.

Lee asked where exactly the lot would be located; Marshall clarified it would be just east of the creek on Holt Road.

Zweizig felt that the "clipping coupons" method of separating off lots along the road from larger Ag parcels is not a good form of development, not the best use of land. This is a policy issue, and it appears that this is Holt Road already. Exum questioned where exactly the driveway was going to be located, as it was not clarified on the maps

provided. Greg Hofmeister stated that the driveway would be located 50-75' west of his, and it is staked out now. Gruebling stated that the quality of the maps provided leave a lot to be desired, other members agreed.

Dregne asked the applicants if they intended to record a CSM; it was unclear with the recent Dillman/Elmer land division if a CSM was required or if a plat of survey would suffice, and it was determined that per the Town's zoning ordinance a CSM is required. Dregne stated that he has not attended a Plan Commission meeting yet where a CSM has been provided, and he believes that this is due to the applicants not wishing to spend the money to have one prepared if they are not certain that their request will be approved. Valid concern. However, Dregne believes that if an application is recommended for approval by the Plan Commission, a CSM should be prepared and available for the following Town Board meeting where the request would be finalized so the Board knows exactly what they are approving. Lee asked if the Plan Commission should be requiring the CSM so they can review it, since they are the ones making the recommendation to the Board. Dregne stated that per the Town's zoning ordinance, the Plan Commission could require it if they want to. Hofmeister stated that Dregne was correct about the cost of a CSM, he suggested that it could be a two meeting submittal process in which the zoning is approved with one meeting, and then the CSM approved at a later meeting. Don Krajeck stated that the Board's intent was to not make applicant provide a CSM if they didn't know if they were going to get approval. Zweizig doesn't think that the Plan Commission has ever made a wrong decision on an application based upon not having a CSM. Hofmeister stated that the Plan Commission doesn't approve driveways, and a driveway would probably not show up on a CSM anyway. Building Inspector Bob Fahey approves driveway permits, and he would look at sight lines, grade issues, etc. Dregne stated that section 16.13 of the subdivision ordinance states that the CSM is entitled to final approval by Board or the Plan Commission if so designated. He was unsure what "if so designated" means, but assumes that it means that the Board can authorize the Plan Commission to approve them.

Public hearing closed at 7:53 p.m.

Francis stated that there are RR parcels out there that have been granted in past. However, according to Gruebling, they were approved prior to the Smart Growth Plan being adopted. Larsen didn't think that an RR parcel could be approved in an area not approved for RR development in the Smart Growth Plan, unless the map was amended.

Francis clarified that the reason he asked if his son was involved in farming was that if he was, they would not have to split off the land to build a home.

Zweizig asked if the land had been deeded to Marshall's son yet, as the application stated that it was. Marshall clarified that it has not been deeded yet.

Gruebling revisited the issue brought up by Larsen, regarding the zoning change to RR being inconsistent with the Smart Growth map. He doesn't believe that the Plan Commission can act on the application until that question is answered. Gruebling believes that Larsen is correct that the map needs to be amended if RR zoning is to be granted. Zweizig questioned if there would be an alternative to RR zoning, perhaps adding more land to the parcel and zoning as A3. Francis stated that an A2 parcel was approved just down the road from this location, one parcel was made into three. Gruebling asked if the request that was approved was dividing off existing farm buildings; Francis stated that it was, in addition to another parcel that was unfarmable. Gruebling stated that then there is a difference between dividing off buildings and dividing off Ag land and building a house on it.

Regarding whether the current application can be approved without changing the Comp Plan, Dregne stated that the Town's subdivision code section 16.08 states that in addition, land division approval must be determined to be, by the Town Board, consistent with the Comp Plan and the most restrictive conditions apply. Additionally, the section stated that the land division shall not be allowed if it conflicts with other goals or policies in Comp Plan. The zoning code states that no land shall be rezoned to RR if not consistent with zoning map. To Dregne, it seems that the ordinances state that the Town is bound by the Comp Plan when making decisions. Larsen agrees, he believes that it was the intent to be bound by the Comp Plan to avoid RR parcels everywhere. Exum clarified that if one more acre was added to the parcel, it could be rezoned A3. Lee believes that the Plan Commission must adhere to the Comp Plan consistently, or not use it at all. Gruebling would like to see the remaining 117 acres deed restricted, so that the goal of farmland preservation is met. Otherwise whittling away at large parcels results in unplanned development in poor locations. If it's going to be deed restricted, Larsen would rather it be RR than A3, although it can't be done by Comp Plan.

Motion to recommend that the Town Board deny the request made by Jerry & Teresa Marshall, 15933 W. Holt Rd., Brooklyn, WI for a land division and zoning change to separate off 2 acres from the existing 120 acre parcel located in the NE ¼, SE ¼ of section 4, parcel #6-20-29.1. The current parcel is zoned A-1; the resulting 2 acre parcel would be

zoned RR, and the parent parcel would retain A-1 zoning. The purpose of the request is to allow their son to build a house. The request is not consistent with the Comprehensive Smart Growth Plan. Motion made by Kim Gruebling. Second by Doug Lee.

Larsen wanted to clarify for the applicants what they would need to do for a future application. Lee felt that requesting an A3 parcel with a deed restriction would be acceptable. Gruebling would like better maps. Larsen mentioned that other requests to separate off A3 parcels from A1 parcels have been denied. Gruebling clarified that the denials were because the parcels had already been split once. Larsen asked if then the policy of the Plan Commission will be that splitting of an A3 parcel and deed restricting the remaining A1 parcel is acceptable. Members agreed that nothing can be guaranteed, as every situation is different. Zweizig was of the opinion that the intent of the A3 zoning districts was to use it on lands with marginal use as Ag land, due to a number of different issues, and this would be a consideration with any request.

Roll call vote: Alvin Francis– Yes; Doug Zweizig – Yes; Kim Gruebling – Yes; Dave Pestor – Yes; Doug Lee – Yes; Eric Larsen – Yes; Renee Exum - Yes. Motion carried 7-0.

**Public Hearing: Review and recommendation of action on request made by Donald Maas, 7337 N. Pleasant Prairie Rd., Evansville, WI and Harold and Mary Abey, 7828 N. State Rd. 104, Evansville, WI to obtain a conditional use permit for 12 months to erect a 60 meter wind measurement tower (MET tower) to collect information for wind turbine feasibility. No utilities or roads will be constructed in conjunction with this request. The parcels is located in the NE ¼, NW ¼ of section 30, parcel #6-20-247 (40 acres); and the SE1/4, NW ¼ of section 30, parcel #6-20-249 (52.9 acres)**

Chairman Francis recused himself due to a conflict of interest; the discussion was chaired by Zweizig.

Public hearing opened at 8:14 p.m.

Zweizig requested that those speaking please keep their comments to 3 minutes, and provide their name.

Gary Haltaufderheide provided a brief presentation of the application. EcoEnergy is requesting to install a temporary 60 meter MET tower on the Abey and Maas properties. EcoEnergy will be acting on their behalf this evening. The tower will record wind speeds and temperatures in the area. Installing the tower gives EcoEnergy information about wind speed and temperatures. A MET tower is installed about 7 miles from the proposed site in Magnolia, and it is gathering good information. MET towers gather accurate information for a distance of approximately 2 miles surrounding the tower. EcoEnergy would like to reaffirm the findings of the existing tower in Magnolia. EcoEnergy wants to obtain accurate data to help make people more comfortable with this project. The tower would be painted in bands of FAA approved orange and white paint. The crop dusting company in the area has been contacted and they have no objection, they stated they will talk to their pilots about the tower. Guy wires will be supported by anchors 4.5 feet into the ground; there will be no concrete foundations. A solar panel will be used to run the data collection equipment. Five sensors are located on tower, measuring wind speeds and directions. Personnel in EcoEnergy's Madison office will review the data. The location of the tower is such as they are trying to take the least amount of farm land out of production and stay as close to lot line as possible. The location as shown on the map may vary 10 feet in either direction, to find the best location. Haltaufderheide contacted neighbors via phone to notify them of the request.

Susan Pestor: regarding the accuracy of the readings, all the information that the Citizens Committee received from the industry stated that readings should be taken at hub height. She is unsure why these readings will not be taken at hub height, and questions if other outside companies will be verifying their information.

Curt Bjurlin, project manager with EcoEnergy: regarding having a MET tower shorter than turbine itself and whether it will provide accurate data: the first stage in a project is to install a temporary tower about 60 meters tall and at a later time-if the tower indicates there is a good wind resource there-then an 80 meter tower would be installed. At that time, EcoEnergy would take all the materials related to the project, including permits and land owner agreements, and hand it over to a financing company which would employ an independent engineer to evaluate the data and investigate whether the project was financeable.

Jim Bembinster, Hwy. C: would EcoEnergy be willing to provide the name of who they spoke to about crop spraying? Haltaufderheide stated he spoke to Brian at Seneca Foods in Janesville. Bembinster stated that another company does the crop spraying here and this person has indicated to Bembinster that the tower could be a problem.

Harold Abey Sr.: has spoken to the individual who does crop spraying in this area, and what he told the Abeys is different than what Bembinster has said. He is willing to come to any meeting and give his opinion. Doesn't have his name, but he lives in Oregon.

Bjurlin stated that crop dusters are allowed to fly at a lower altitude than other airplanes and at a closer proximity to things. It is part of the job description of crop dusters to fly close to and around obstructions, including power lines, silos, etc.

Lee would like to get the aircraft information first hand, and find out if it will be a financial burden to the affected airplane flyers? Would like to hear from them directly, from the pilot who flies off Maas' property. Would it put them out of business? Gruebling agrees that Lee makes a good point, however this is an open meeting that was published in paper and the crop duster could have come if he wanted to and felt that the issue would affect his livelihood. Lee stated that he may not live in the area, and therefore does not have easy access to meeting information.

Tom Drew, Magnolia: the MET tower referenced earlier is located on their property. They have had no problems with anything related to the tower. Has a person who crop dusts within ½ mile of tower and he has had no problems.

Lee presented an article from Lubbock, Texas where a crop duster hit a MET tower and the pilot was killed. He would prefer to see the tower lit, it is only one foot lower than the FAA required height for lighting. Would EcoEnergy be willing to install lighting? Bjurlin stated that lighting the tower would require more electricity than would be generated by the solar panel.

Elaine Strassburg, Cty C: would the main purpose of this tower be to determine if it's feasible to erect a wind turbine? Bjurlin stated yes, the sole purpose of tower is to evaluate wind speed with the future purpose of harnessing the resource with a turbine. Strassburg asked if there is a specific period of time that the tower would be up and what would be the status of the tower once the measurements are complete. Zweizig explained that the application is for 12 months, after that time it would be taken down. Bjurlin stated that at the 12 month expiration date, they may wish to request a renewal if wind resources measurements are positive. In any case, the MET towers are temporary structures.

Public hearing closed at 8:38 p.m.

Exum mentioned that EcoEnergy is on record stating that the turbines could power 1200 homes; does the MET tower in Magnolia indicate the capability could be less? Bjurlin stated that the information gathered from the Drew property indicates it may, but a MET tower in the center of the project area will provide better information. The tower location on the map is not the highest location in area, but it will provide better information about wind flow and variability. EcoEnergy is basing their evaluation thus far on the Drew property data but would have better answer with data from the proposed MET tower.

Gruebling asked if any members of the Plan Commission visited the MET tower site in Magnolia; several had including Exum, Zweizig and Pestor. It is a 60 meter tower, as is the one proposed for Union.

Dregne stated that the request is located in an A1 district; the zoning ordinance lists allowed conditional uses within A1 parcels - where does this request fit in the existing list? Lee believes that it doesn't fit. Is there another zoning district that would allow something like this? No. Cell towers have been permitted, perhaps under the "telephone and telegraph transmission lines" item. Both temporary and permanent structures need to be allowed under conditional uses or permitted uses. MET tower is not really a wind turbine, thinks that the town has jurisdiction but it is not clearly addressed in ordinance. Francis stated that the "temporary" provision was used in the past, for an asphalt plant on the George property when Highway 14 was repaved.

Zoning ordinance section 17.03 (C) allows for temporary uses in any zoning district, and therefore items that are not allowed as a conditional or permitted use on a permanent basis can be approved on a temporary basis. Does it need to comply with setbacks? Dregne stated that it is reasonable to assume that they must comply with setbacks. The section in question also states that the approval is subject to any conditions set by the Plan Commission.

Would an 80 meter tower be permanent? Bjurlin stated that 80 meter towers can be permanent, but would likely not be in the same location as the 60 meter tower.

If setbacks apply, then putting the MET tower on the lot line would not meet the setback requirements. Bjurlin stated that there would be no fence around tower, but it is a climbable structure with the proper equipment. This site was



chosen to minimize the impact on surrounding Ag land. A variance would be needed to address the setback issue, which would be reviewed and approved or denied by the Board of Adjustment.

Dregne stated that the Plan Commission could issue a CUP with the condition that the variance be approved by the Board of Adjustment. Krajeck asked if the property owners could agree to waive the setback requirements. Dregne stated they could not, as the setback requirement is a zoning ordinance requirement, and state law requires variance requests go to the Board of Adjustment, who grant variances if the legal standards are met.

If they chose to move the tower, it would need to be 50 feet from a property line. Lee asked if the 50 foot setback would apply to the tower itself, or the guy wires; Dregne felt and the Plan Commission agreed that the setback would be from the guy wires. Dregne felt that considering that the applicants are trying to minimize Ag land disturbance and the fact that the tower is a temporary structure, they would have a good case for a variance.

Pestor stated that if a CUP for the MET tower was granted before the large wind energy ordinance is completed, EcoEnergy should acknowledge that granting the CUP for the MET tower in no way implies that the Town is agreeing to a wind turbine. Bjurlin agrees. Pestor does not want EcoEnergy to get the wrong intent, and assume that a turbine may be put up.

Lee believes that the Town has an obligation to let EcoEnergy investigate to see if turbines are feasible, since we've spent so much time on the large wind energy ordinance. Bjurlin stated that EcoEnergy has no problem agreeing to Pestor's request and putting it in writing.

Exum asked if EcoEnergy would share the data collected from the tower with the Town; Bjurlin stated that they would, and they are currently sharing the information from the tower on the Drew property with the Town of Magnolia. Bjurlin further stated that the information is generally shared on an annual basis, and that the raw data is proprietary, but would provide analyzed data, either in hard copy or electronically. Exum wondered if the Town would be concerned with the accuracy of the data provided. Gruebling doesn't think that the Town should be concerned about it, as it is not under their authority. Zweizig stated that the Town can only be concerned with issues of health and safety.

Motion to approve the request made by Donald Maas, 7337 N. Pleasant Prairie Rd., Evansville, WI and Harold and Mary Abey, 7828 N. State Rd. 104, Evansville, WI to obtain a conditional use permit for 12 months to erect a 60 meter wind measurement tower (MET tower) to collect information for wind turbine feasibility. No utilities or roads will be constructed in conjunction with this request. The parcels is located in the NE ¼, NW ¼ of section 30, parcel #6-20-247 (40 acres); and the SE1/4, NW ¼ of section 30, parcel #6-20-249 (52.9 acres). The approval is conditioned upon the applicants either obtaining a variance to the setback requirements, or moving the tower to meet the setback requirements, and notifying the Plan Commission which of the two alternatives they intend to implement and where the tower will ultimately be located. Motion made by Kim Gruebling. Second by Eric Larsen.

Bjurlin asked for clarification that if they do not obtain a variance they can choose to move the tower. That is correct.

Exum expressed concern about crop dusters. It is indicated that the tower will have orange paint, would like that included in the motion as a requirement, as well as requiring that the guy wires be identified with cable balls, or similar markers. Bjurlin stated that typically, yellow bands are placed on the outermost sections of guy wire.

Motion to amend the original motion to include a method for increased visibility on the MET tower for air traffic and increased visibility on the guy wires, specifically orange paint on the tower and yellow tape or flags which will remain in place and visible for 12 months on the outermost guy wires, to meet FAA regulations made by Renee Exum. Second by Kim Gruebling.

Amendment carried by unanimous voice vote.

Roll call vote: Alvin Francis– Yes; Doug Zweizig – Yes; Kim Gruebling – Yes; Dave Pestor – Yes; Doug Lee – Yes; Eric Larsen – Yes; Renee Exum - Yes. Motion carried 7-0.

Regarding the draft wind ordinance: Dregne distributed copies which were current as of 9.24.08 to the Plan Commission.

Krajeck mentioned that if the Plan Commission intends to have a public hearing on the final ordinance, it will have to be done at the October meeting. Dregne stated that the summary of the wind ordinance process, which was developed at the beginning of process, states that the Plan Commission will hold a public hearing (they have had two)

and it then makes a final recommendation to the Town Board. The Town Board is required to hold a public *meeting*, not necessarily a public *hearing*. It will be the Board's decision how they wish to proceed.

Gruebling would like to have the final review of the ordinance at the next regular meeting, but it should be the first item on the agenda. Additionally, he believes that the Plan Commission has done its duty on having public hearings, and doesn't need to hold more.

It was agreed that the final draft of the ordinance will be reviewed at regular October meeting, and it will be first on the agenda.

**Discussion on process for review of Comprehensive Plan, timeline for review, etc.**

Francis cited page nine, "Implementation" of the Comprehensive Plan. He believes that the intent was to decide if the goals and objectives were being met and if there were any amendments that were needed. Francis would like the item on the agenda for the next meeting, with the intent to have a discussion regarding whether the goals and objectives were met and if any amendments will be needed. He would not intend to discuss any amendments at the next meeting, just to decide if any changes may be needed. It was agreed that the item will be on October agenda.

Motion to adjourn made by Kim Gruebling. Second by Renee Exum. Meeting adjourned at 9:25.

*Respectfully submitted by:*  
*Regina Ylvisaker, Clerk*

Note: Minutes are considered draft until reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission at a properly noticed meeting.